



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/578,117

05/01/2006

Yuri Borisovich Sokolov

0155.0003US1

5024

29127 7590 03/12/2010
HOUSTON ELISEEVA
4 MILITIA DRIVE, SUITE 4
LEXINGTON, MA 02421

EXAMINER

BROCKMAN, ANGEL T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2463

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/12/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/578,117	Applicant(s) SOKOLOV ET AL.	
	Examiner ANGEL BROCKMAN	Art Unit 2463	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02/24/2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 May 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Finality

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 4 and 5 were formerly objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c). Pursuant to applicant's amendments, these objections have been withdrawn.
2. Claims 1-5 were formerly rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a). Pursuant to applicant's amendments, these rejections have been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see Remarks filed February 24, 2010 with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Merwin et al.(US 5,691,691).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

Art Unit: 2463

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1,2, and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato et al. (US 6,021, 137, hereinafter Kato) in view of Merwin et al.(US 5,691,691, hereinafter Merwin).

Regarding **claim 1**, Kato discloses a timing signal source periodically transmitting timing signals comprising one or more timing signal symbols and using a reference signal to determine when each timing signal is transmitted(column 7, lines 58-65, wherein the polling signal is the timing signal); a plurality of numbered slave units (figure 1, wherein slave units are terminals 2-4, column 10, lines 1-25); each numbered slave unit receiving at least one timing signal and using the voltage to determine when each timing signal symbol is received (column 13, lines 65-column 14, lines 1-5, wherein the superimposed spread signal on the power line is the voltage); each numbered slave unit transmitting a data signal using its number and time when a timing signal is received to determine when to begin transmitting so that data signals from the slave units do not overlap with each other or with the timing signals (column 8, lines 14-30, wherein response signal is transmitted after a predetermined time to avoid overlap); a main unit receiving the data signals from the slave units ((130), wherein the data collector is the

Art Unit: 2463

main unit). Kato does not disclose the superimposed signal includes AC current on a power line to determine when each timing symbol is received. However, it is well known in the art that the AC power line includes a superimposed AC current (column 1, lines 25-36, column 3, lines 10-25). Merwin discloses the slave units determine when each time symbol is received (column 3, lines 32-36). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the AC current as disclosed by Merwin along with the data collection system as disclosed by Kato. The superimposed AC current signal as disclosed by Merwin can be implemented in the system of Kato through software and hardware manipulation. The motivation for utilizing the AC current as disclosed by Hicks and the data collection system as disclosed by Kato is to increase efficiency of the network by increasing the transmission rate (column 2, lines 35-40, Merwin).

Regarding **claim 2**, Kato discloses in case of temporary absence of the timing signals, the slave units continue transmission computing when to begin transmitting using a previously received timing signal (see figure 6, figure 7, column 9, lines 54-66, where the period of time waited is the absence of timing signal and the polling signal is low response signal of A1 includes the computing of the half-cycle).

Regarding **claim 6**, Kato discloses the timing signal source is the main unit (column 7, lines 58-65, wherein the data collector generates the timing signals).

Art Unit: 2463

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kato (US 6,021,137, hereinafter Kato) and Merwin in view of Tanaka et al.(US 4,998,245, hereinafter Tanaka).

Regarding **claim 4**, Kato discloses a timing signal is subjected to modulation (figure 8, where the reference signal is subjected to the primary modulating circuit. Kato and Hicks disclose all subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of broadcast data transmission from a main unit to slave ones. Tanaka discloses broadcast data transmission from a main unit to slave ones (figure 1, figure 5, column 3, lines 15-40). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the broadcast transmission of Tanaka and modulation of Kato and Merwin. The modulation and broadcast transmission as disclosed by Tanaka can be implemented into the system of Kato and Merwin through software implementation. The motivation for utilizing the modulation and broadcast transmission as disclosed by Tanaka in the system as disclosed by Kato and Merwin is to increase the efficiency of the system.

5. Claims 3,5, and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over and Kato(US 6,021,137, hereinafter Kato) and Merwin in view of (Lester et al.(US 6,784,790 B1, hereinafter Lester) .

Regarding **claim 3**, Kato and Merwin disclose all subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of source supplying a timing signal is not a system main

Art Unit: 2463

unit but some other individual device. Lester discloses a source supplying a timing signal is not a system main unit (column 4, lines 61-67, column 5, lines 10-15, column 8, lines 20-47, where the IC is a micro chip or microprocessor). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the timing signal as disclosed by Lester along with the system as disclosed by Kato and Merwin. The other units as disclosed by Lester can be implemented into the system as disclosed by Kato and Merwin can be manipulated through software. The motivation for utilizing another device as the timing signal as disclosed by Lester along with the system as disclosed by Kato and Merwin is to increase the efficiency of the network.

Regarding **claim 5**, Kato discloses all signals being transmitted by a main and slave units have duration equal to $1/3$ of the network voltage (column 14, lines 4-10, where the certain period of time is $1/3$ of the network voltage). Kato and Merwin disclose all subject matter of the claimed invention as set forth above in claim 1, with the exception of the zero crossing points centering. Lester discloses sending a timing signal of a predetermined form (figure 4A, column 5, lines 53-66, column 6, lines 1-29, where the reference pulse includes the timing signal); zero crossing points of the fundamental harmonic of system supply network voltage (column 5, lines 55-65). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the duration or the network voltage and AC reference signal as disclosed by Kato and Merwin along with the system as disclosed by and Lester. The duration of the transmitted signals can be implemented using software. The motivation for utilizing the

Art Unit: 2463

duration of 1/3 of the AC current voltage half-cycle and centered about zero crossing points is to increase the efficiency of the system.

Regarding **claim 7**, Kato and Merwin disclose all subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of each timing symbol is transmitted over a half-cycle of the AC current voltage. Lester discloses of each timing symbol is transmitted over a half-cycle of the AC current voltage(column 5, lines 43-65). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the half-cycling as disclosed by Lester along with the system as disclosed by Kato and Merwin. The half-cycling can be implemented through software implementation. The motivation for utilizing the half-cycling is to increase the efficiency of the system.

Regarding **claim 8**, Kato and Merwin disclose all subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of the start of each timing signal symbol transmission is when the AC current voltage value is zero. Lester discloses the start of each timing signal symbol transmission is when the AC current voltage value is zero (column 2, lines 15-26, wherein the zero crossing points mark beginning of transmission). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the zero crossings for transmission as disclosed by Lester along with the system as disclosed by Kato and Merwin. The zero crossings for transmission can be implemented through software implementation. The motivation for utilizing the zero crossings for transmission is to increase the efficiency of the system.

Regarding **claim 9**, Kato and Merwin disclose all subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of each data signal is transmitted over a half-cycle of the AC current voltage. Lester discloses of each timing symbol is transmitted over a half-cycle of the AC current voltage(column 5, lines 43-65, therefore data is transmitted in the other half cycle, as a period is made up of one cycle). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the half-cycling as disclosed by Lester along with the system as disclosed by Kato and Merwin. The half-cycling can be implemented through software implementation. The motivation for utilizing the half-cycling is to increase the efficiency of the system.

Regarding **claim 10**, Kato and Merwin disclose all subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of the start of each data signal transmission is when the AC current voltage value is zero. Lester discloses the start of each data signal symbol transmission is when the AC current voltage value is zero (column 2, lines 15-26, wherein the zero crossing points mark beginning of transmission). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the zero crossings for transmission as disclosed by Lester along with the system as disclosed by Kato and Merwin. The zero crossings for transmission can be implemented through software implementation. The motivation for utilizing the zero crossings for transmission is to increase the efficiency of the system.

Regarding **claim 11**, Kato and Merwin disclose all subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of an N-th half cycle of the AC current voltage (column 5, lines 43-65, therefore data is transmitted in the second or (N-th) half cycle, as a period

Art Unit: 2463

is made up of one cycle). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the half-cycling as disclosed by Lester along with the system as disclosed by Kato and Merwin. The half-cycling can be implemented through software implementation. The motivation for utilizing the half-cycling is to increase the efficiency of the system.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANGEL BROCKMAN whose telephone number is (571)270-5664. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday ,7:30-5:00pm.

7. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Derrick Ferris can be reached on 571-272-3123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 2463

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ANGEL BROCKMAN
Examiner
Art Unit 2463

/A. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 2463

/Derrick W Ferris/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2463